



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,839	03/31/2004	Hugh B. Svendsen	1104-062	6056

27820 7590 10/10/2006

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.  
P.O. BOX 1287  
CARY, NC 27512

EXAMINER

BLUDAU, BRANDON S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2132

DATE MAILED: 10/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/813,839	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SVENDSEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Brandon S. Bludau	<b>Art Unit</b> 2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-4, 15-20 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeBruine (US Patent 7043644).
2. As per claim 1, DeBruine discloses a method for providing a Web browser running on a computer with HTTP access to a peer server located behind a firewall in a peer-to-peer network, comprising:
  - (a) providing the peer-to-peer network with a proxy server (column 5 lines 35-53);
  - (b) registering an outbound socket connection with the proxy server by the peer server (column 5 lines 43-45);
  - (c) in response to the proxy server receiving an HTTP request to access the peer server from the Web browser, translating the HTTP request into a request packet and sending the request packet to the peer server (column 7 lines 36-43); and
  - (d) in response to the peer server receiving the request packet, translating the request packet back into the HTTP request and responding to the request, thereby enabling generic web traffic to flow (column 7 lines 44-54).

Art Unit: 2132

DeBruine doesn't specifically disclose providing access for a web browser, however, this is a necessary implementation in the client node considering the transport of HTTP requests over TCP/IP.

3. As per claim 2, DeBruine discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the peer server further includes a Web server, step (d) further including the steps of:

- (i) responding to request by passing the HTTP request to the Web server;
- (ii) receiving an HTTP response from Web server;
- (iii) translating HTTP response into a response packet;
- (iv) sending the response packet to peer server to the proxy server over the outbound socket connection;
- (v) receiving the response packet on the proxy server and translating a response packet back into the HTTP response; and
- (vi) sending the HTTP response from the peer server to the Web browser

(column 7 lines 19-54).

4. As per claim 3, DeBruine discloses the method of claim 2 wherein the peer-to-peer network includes multiple peer servers, and the proxy server is separate and apart from the peer servers (see Fig. 1A).

5. As per claim 4, DeBruine discloses the method of claim 3 further including the step of: providing each of the peer servers with a peer node, a Web server, and a Web browser (column 6 lines 1-11, DeBruine doesn't specifically disclose a web browser, however as noted above, this is a necessary and common implementation).

Art Unit: 2132

6. As per claim 15, DeBruine discloses the method of claim 2 but does not disclose wherein step (d) further includes the step of: breaking the HTTP response into chunks and sending the chunks to the proxy server in successive peer response packets.

The Examiner asserts that the method of breaking a response into chunks is a commonly implemented step in prior art. It would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify DeBruine to include where the HTTP response is divided into chunks and sent in successive response packets.

Motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify DeBruine as discussed above would be to reduce latency time in the transmission of the packets or to prioritize the response of certain packet information as is commonly implemented and well known in the art.

7. As per claim 16, DeBruine discloses the method of claim 15 but does not disclose wherein step (d) further includes the step of: providing the peer server with several threads for handling HTTP requests from the proxy server, and multiplexing responses to those requests over the same response socket back to the proxy server.

The Examiner notes that it is commonly practiced in the art for a server to maintain multiple threads for processing several simultaneous requests; and in view of DeBruine, wherein the peer server maintains a singular socket connection with the proxy server, it is necessary that the responses be multiplexed over this same response socket to the proxy server, as would be evident and obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Art Unit: 2132

8. Claims 17-20 are rejected because they disclose similar subject matter to claims 1-4 respectively.
9. Claims 31 and 32 are rejected because they disclose similar subject matter to claims 15 and 16 respectively.
10. Claims 33 and 34 are rejected because they disclose similar subject matter to claim 2.
11. Claims 5-14 and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeBruine (US Patent 7043644), and further in view of Perry (US PgPub 20030154306).
12. As per claim 5, DeBruine discloses the method of claim 4 further including step of: providing the peer-to-peer network with a registration server (column 5 lines 56-67) but does not disclose a DNS server.

Perry discloses a peer-to-peer network implementing a DNS server (paragraph [0053]).

Perry is analogous art because it is directed to a method of proxying connections in a peer-to-peer network.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify DeBruine to include wherein the peer-to-peer network implements a DNS server.

Motivation to modify DeBruine as discussed above would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill and is such to provide a method of network addressing the plurality of clients in the network as is well known and commonly applied in the art.

Art Unit: 2132

13. As per claim 6, DeBruine discloses the method of claim 5 wherein step (b) further includes the step of: passing a name of the peer server from the peer server to the registration server, and receiving a name and IP address of the proxy server to which it is assigned (column 6 lines 1-57).

14. As per claim 7, DeBruine discloses the method of claim 6 wherein step (b) further includes the step of: registering by the peer server, the name of the proxy server, and the IP address of the proxy server with the DNS server (column 6 lines 58-67; DeBruine doesn't specifically disclose the DNS server, however in view of the above rejection to claim 5 wherein a DNS server is employed for network addressing, this is a necessary implementation and is well-known and commonly performed in the art).

15. As per claim 8, DeBruine discloses the method of claim 7, wherein step (b) further includes the step of: after the peer server registers with the proxy server, notifying a user of the computer via e-mail that content exists on the peer server for viewing, and including a URL of the peer server in the e-mail (column 4 line 22-column 5 line 13; wherein it can be inferred that the server notifies the client through e-mail since the client registers an e-mail address with the server. Moreover, this is a very well known and commonly practiced implementation in the art).

16. As per claim 9, DeBruine discloses the method of claim 8, but does not disclose wherein step (b) further includes the step of: in response to the user clicking on the URL e-mail, the computer contacts the DNS server to determine an identity of the proxy server in which to send the HTTP request.

The Examiner asserts, that in view of the rejection to claims 5 and 7 wherein a DNS server is used for network addressing and mapping, it would be a necessary implementation in DeBruine wherein the DNS server is contacted and the address of the proxy server is resolved.

17. As per claim 10, DeBruine discloses a method of claim 3 further including the step of: providing the proxy server with a servlet thread, a registration manager, a peer manager, a peer MessageBox, and a peer packet manager thread (see figure 5 and column 6 lines 1-11).

18. As per claim 11, DeBruine discloses the method of claim 10 wherein step (c) further includes the step of: receiving the HTTP request as a URL by the servlet thread and using the registration manager to determine if the peer server identified in requesting URL is registered with the peer server, and if so, returning the corresponding peer socket (column 7 lines 36-43).

19. As per claim 12, DeBruine discloses the method of claim 11 wherein step (c) further includes the step of: creating, by the servlet thread, a peer request packet, and passing the peer request packet to the peer manager (column 7 lines 36-49).

20. As per claim 13, DeBruine discloses the method of claim 12, but does not disclose wherein step (c) further includes the step of: providing the peer request packet with a MessageBoxID, an HTTP URL, HTTP headers, and an HTTP Post Data field.

The Examiner asserts that the limitations listed are commonly used in the implementation of HTTP protocol. It is commonly practiced and would be obvious to



Art Unit: 2132

one of ordinary skill in the art to include the method of DeBruine with the selected fields transmitted in the HTTP packet request.

21. As per claim 14, DeBruine discloses the method of claim 13 wherein step (c) further includes the step of: finding by the peer manager, the socket connection to the peer server, and passing the peer request packet to the peer server (column 7 lines 35-43).

22. Claims 21-30 are rejected because they disclose similar subject matter to claims 5-14 respectively.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Takeda (US PgPub 2004/0139227); Stephenson et al. (US PgPub 2002/0023143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon S. Bludau whose telephone number is 571-272-3722. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Friday 8:00-5:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2132

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brandon S Bludau  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2132

BB  
\*\*\*

  
GILBERTO BARRON JR  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100